

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Williams

10/081,419 Application No.:

Art Unit: 3752

Filed: 2/22/2002

Examiner:

Ganey

Scale Hazards

Title:

Attorney Docket No.: 50051

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## AMENDMENT AND SUBMISSION AFTER FINAL **UNDER §116**

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action of June 30, 2006, made final, please amend this application as follows:

## In the claims:

Please amend the claims as per the attached claim amendment sheet.

Around-the-Pump Additive System for Industrial

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Action mailed 6/30/2006, applicant requests the attached claims amendment be entered to present the claims in better form for appeal. The amendment should remove the first ground of rejection under §112, second paragraph, as well as the ground of rejection under §101. (Applicant presumes that it is inappropriate to amend "withdrawn" claims at this time.)

The first §112, second paragraph, rejection and the §101 rejection were new in the above referenced Action. The rejections appear to be based upon applicant's use of the word "system" to refer to both apparatus claims and method claims. Applicant amends the claims herein so that "system" claims uniformly refer to apparatus claims and method claims are denominated by the word "method." (Applicant does note that the definition of "system" in Webster's, copy attached, covers both apparatus and method.)

Attached also find for subsequent reference a web page print out from Rain for Rent, a renter of pumps. On the front of the page are applicant's attorney's notes 8/8/06 reflecting that Daniel at Rain for Rent related by phone that none of the below pumps had a 2.5" inlet. Attached also find pages from regulations for fire pumps and associated equipment, regulations 1901-45. In particular regulations